

*Vote for States Law!*

## **Scholars Call on State and Federal Magistrates to Ignore SCOTUS Sodomite Ruling - Freedom Outpost**

Theology is important. In fact a very wise man once said, "Everyone is a theologian, some are just bad at theology." We see this almost daily as we go through life, and we see people live out what they believe. It is no different when we get to jurisprudence. We either have a firm grasp on what it means to uphold the law or we do not. We understand how legitimate authority is exercised, or we do not. It is good to see that some of our best legal minds get these concepts.

Christian News reports:

A group of over 60 legal scholars have signed a statement calling upon American citizens and public officials alike to reject the U.S. Supreme Court's opinion declaring that states must legalize same-sex "marriage."

"We stand with James Madison and Abraham Lincoln in recognizing that the Constitution is not whatever a majority of Supreme Court justices say it is," said Robert George, founder of American Principles Project, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence at Princeton University and one of the authors of the statement.

"We remind all officeholders in the United States that they are pledged to uphold the Constitution of the United States, not the will of five members of the Supreme Court."

As I have stated numerous times, there is a difference between an ordinance of the State (Local, State, and/or Federal laws) and Law. The State can speak an ordinance as if it was law, and can even make you comply with that law, but these actions do not make that ordinance legal. It does not mean that that command is a Law.

Our founders understood that, and this is why they had two safeguards. First, they had the Constitution. This, much like Scriptures for the Christian, was a place to appeal. The second was the ability to write amendments. This gave the people, through their representatives, the ability to correct or add that which was lacking in the law.

Never was the Supreme Court to be allowed to read back into the Constitution what they wanted it to say. This is a clear breach of the law. These Justices essentially made law, which is not their job. Our recourse is simple; we are to ignore or reject this unjust ruling.

Christian News continues:

"The Court's majority opinion eschewed reliance on the text, logic, structure, or original understanding of the Constitution, as well as the Court's own interpretative doctrines and precedents, and supplied no compelling reasoning to show why it is unjustified for the laws of the states to sustain marriage as it has been understood for millennia as the union of husband and wife," the statement reads.

The reason the Supreme Court could not supply these things is because they simply are not there. Nowhere in the Constitution is marriage mentioned. Nowhere is the Federal government given any power concerning marriage. Then the only thing that the Supreme Court could do was to either send the case back to its state courts or write law from the bench. Unfortunately, they chose the second option. Therefore, these scholars call on the elected officials and judges to uphold the law by ignoring their ruling.

Christian News reports:

"We call on all federal and state officeholders: To refuse to accept Obergefell as binding precedent for all but the specific plaintiffs in that case; to recognize the authority of states to define marriage, and the right of federal and state officeholders to act in accordance with those definitions; to pledge full and mutual legal and political assistance to anyone who refuses to follow Obergefell for constitutionally protected reasons," they wrote.

When we understand that all rule and authority comes from God, then we understand that any rule or authority in opposition to God is abortive. God has given the people ruling us their position, but they have rebelled against the source of that authority. Therefore, we are no longer obliged to obey these rebellious authorities.

But Peter and the apostles answered, "We must obey God rather than men." Acts 5:29

Theme Swift by SwiftThemes.Com Copyright © 2015 Freedom Outpost | Entries (RSS) and Comments (RSS) powered by WordPress

Government started requiring  
licenses to be married so government  
could make money from the fees -  
Marriage is not a government  
affair, it belongs to the Church!

Man's Law is not above  
God's Law !!

## Safeguarding Constitutional Rights in Texas - Freedom Outpost

*S. CAROLINA*

The Founding Fathers believed that the United States of America and her individual states should never be subservient to any foreign power or legal system, and that no foreign legal system or foreign policy should be allowed to encroach upon our rights that are protected by the federal or state Constitutions.

In passing Texas Laws for Texas Courts (TLTC, known nationally as American Law for American Courts or ALAC), we are preserving the individual rights of all citizens and the liberties and freedoms protected by the Constitution of the State of Texas.

Furthermore, TLTC prevents encroachment from any foreign law/policy or transnationalism that would impact Texas citizens when they enter a Texas courtroom. For example, the outcome of a family legal proceeding related to marriage, divorce, or parent-child relationships (collectively comprising 90% of all foreign law cases in this nation and in Texas) would be compromised by allowing foreign law or transnational policies. In virtually every case that foreign law is applied, it is to the detriment of women and children. TLTC would safeguard against the misapplied use of comity of foreign judgments, choice of law clauses, and choice of foreign forum clauses, and would explicitly prevent targeting those from other races and religions, etc., to protect their constitutional rights.

Texas, like all states and our nation as a whole, has a process that has given us the rules and policies by which we govern and live our lives. The three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—are to be a balance of authority and guidance to benefit the citizenry. This system is to provide safeguards to the balance of power and to prevent overreaching and/or judicial activism. *→ SAME SEX MARRIAGE - 2 WOMEN JUDGES ARE GAY ACTIVISTS!*

Our state legislative body has a vital role to play in preserving constitutional rights and Texan values of liberty and freedom. This is not a role to be left to the courts.

Texas Laws for Texas Courts is facially neutral: it does not single out any specific religion or foreign nation; it does not apply to corporations, nor does it affect international contracts or international trade laws or treaties. In the most practical application, this law is about safeguarding Texans' constitutional rights.

The concerns of foreign law creeping into our court systems are valid through two streams: a transnational mindset and documented court cases where foreign law has been applied. As mentioned earlier, one of the most obvious occurrences of foreign law has presented itself in marriage and family law issues. A study of foreign law cases can be reviewed at shariahinamericancourts.com, with over 50 sample cases from appellate courts (this is only listing cases from the appellate level and higher).

Transnationalism (laws applied from other countries or international organizations such as United Nations) has surfaced across our nation. Notable instances include the Massachusetts Supreme Court's citing of Canadian Law in their overturning the definition of

S. CAROLINA

marriage case, and the U.S. Supreme Court's (Lawrence vs. Texas) citing European Court of Human Rights in the decision to strike down a statute in Texas and 14 other states.

On numerous occasions, U. S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg touts the validity of using international law in her assessing and assigning opinions in the Court. "Why Obama Loves Ginsberg" (by Jan LaRue, The American Thinker, 2/11/12) gives insight into Ginsberg's progressive thinking. Whether or not one agrees with the court's final decision is not the issue; we have a governing system containing checks and balances within our nation, specifically designed for the protection of our sovereignty undergirded by our constitution at the national and state level.

TLTC does not discriminate or target any specific religion, race, or class, but it does protect ALL citizens by ensuring that they are guaranteed equality in a courtroom, regardless of their social or economic status. One would think the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Anti-Defamation League (ADL), and Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) would endorse this legislation wholeheartedly; instead, they are its strongest opponents.

Legislation that stands to safeguard equality and ensures that each voice is represented begs the question, "To which constitutional right does ACLU, ADL or CAIR not want guaranteed to ALL?"

*CAIR is an arm of Hamas!*

The passage of Texas Law for Texas Courts leaves no question that Constitutional rights will be guaranteed to all her citizens. Thus, no individuals are excluded from its application in the courtroom, all are protected from encroachment of foreign laws, and our sovereignty is upheld.

Theme Swift by SwiftThemes.Com Copyright © 2015 Freedom Outpost | Entries (RSS) and Comments (RSS) powered by WordPress

*Obama had an agenda when he came into office: Bankrupt country, destroy jobs, energy, military and health care, make as many as possible dependent on government (Saul Alinsky) Start a war between races, on police and on religion. I load the country with Muslims, like himself to set up a Caliphate, Obama is waging jihad from the Oval Office and this country is too blind to see it! Let's pray our Gallenars see it!*

Proud of you, you have been  
steadfast during flooding. A great  
sawman

Charlotte